

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8
9

10 BERNARD KEITH WALLS,

No. C 06-0502 WHA (PR)

11 Plaintiff,

**DISMISSAL WITH LEAVE TO
AMEND**

12 v.

13 CLASSIFICATION FACILITY,
14 MEDICAL SGT. DEPUTY,
ADMINISTRATION,

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 This is a civil rights case file pro se by an inmate at the San Mateo County Jail who is a
18 frequent litigator in this court. The complaint was dismissed with leave to amend. Plaintiff has
19 filed three amendments (documents 8, 9, and 10 on the docket). They are in narrative form on
20 notebook paper, and because under this circuit's law an amended complaint completely replaces
21 its processor, *see Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1262 (9th Cir. 1992), the operative
22 complaint is the last amendment, rather than all three together. This pretty clearly is not what
23 plaintiff intends, and certainly the amended complaint is not manageable in its present form.


24 The amended complaint is again **DISMISSED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**. Plaintiff may
25 file one more amended complaint within thirty days of the date this order is entered. The
26 amended complaint must be on the Court's form for prisoner Section 1983 complaints. Plaintiff
27 must write "Amended Complaint" on the first page, and must also put the case number for this
28 case, C 06-0502 WHA (PR), on the first page, so the amended complaint is not mistaken for an

1 attempt to file a new case.

2 If plaintiff does not file an amended complaint, or if it does not state a claim, this case
3 will be dismissed with prejudice. No further amendments will be permitted.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 Dated: 7/22/07



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE